

67008-123
S-5669REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the detailed remarks, the allowance of claims 20, 21, and 34-37 and the allowability of claims 39 and 40. Claims 11, 30, 38, and 40 have been amended and claims 22-29 and 39 have been cancelled. New claims 42-52 are presented. Accordingly 11-21 and 30-38 and 40-52 are pending.

Claims 11, 13-16, 38 and 41 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hamilton et al* in view of *Hall et al*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as there is absolutely no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify *Hamilton* in view of *Hall*.

As previously discussed, *Hamilton* is only concerned with projecting a simulated canopy frame on a helmet mounted display and makes no mention of specific usage therefore. Although projecting a simulated canopy frame on a helmet mounted display may effectively increase general situation awareness, such a simulated canopy frame cannot facilitate landing at a designated landing point. That is, even during daylight operations when the canopy frame is clearly visible to the air crew, the canopy frame itself does not facilitate aircraft landing at a desired landing point.

As admitted by the Examiner, *Hamilton* completely fails to disclose or suggest aircraft position with respect to a landing point. In fact, *Hamilton* provides no disclosure whatsoever regarding aircraft position with respect to either a landing point or an approach thereto.




Hall discloses a moving map display in which various points such as the aircraft position and a landing point are disclosed. *Hall* recites that:

In operation, the processor 32 uses the digital terrain elevation data to display a digital moving map image on the display screen 38 that may be centered at a latitude and longitude supplied to the processor 32 from the GPS receiver 42. The processor 32 updates the displayed image each time it receives a new latitude and longitude. Thus, as the helicopter 12 moves, the latitude and longitude sensed by the GPS receiver 42 changes and the map image is updated, giving the appearance of a single continuously scrolling map image moving across the surface of the display area of the display screen 38.
[Col. 5, lines 18-28.]

Hall makes no reference to imaging systems or to the fusion of imagery information. The Examiner argues that Figure 4 of *Hall* teaches the desirability of fusing aircraft position 54 with respect to landing position 62 on a display with image data. Figure 4, however, is simply a terrain

67008-123
S-5669

elevation map for creating an approach to a position on the ground. That is, Figure 4 of *Hall* essentially just plots a flight path for the aircraft to a designated landing position 62 (see Figure 3). Such flight path navigation planning is conventional.



67008-123
S-5669

In other words, *Hall* simply utilizes a GPS system and a mapping device 46 to define an approach 60 to the landing position 62. In short, *Hall* is just a navigation system. Once the aircraft reaches the landing position 62, *Hall* does nothing to neither increase situational awareness nor provide symbology to facilitate situational awareness as recited in amended claim 11, 30, and 38.

The Examiner states that "Hamilton discloses a helicopter display system comprising sensing means 84 receiving environmental information *about the canopy environment* of the helicopter, imaging system 40, processor 100 for fusing the environmental data and imaging data on a common display (Fig. 7), except for showing aircraft position with respect to a landing point." Notably, the only information which *Hamilton* provides is, as admitted by the Examiner, *information about the canopy environment*. Such canopy environment information is completely related to the structure of the aircraft itself. It is only relevant when the aircrew is utilizing a helmet mounted display system. There is simply no motivation to fuse a simulated canopy frame environment with the navigation system of *Hall* as no benefit will result therefrom. The claims are properly allowable.

The balance of the rejections also utilize *Hamilton* in view of *Hall* and are therefore improper for at least the reasons discussed above.

Even if the combination were properly made – which it is not – there are differences between the claimed invention and the teachings of the cited references such that the combination does not meet the limitations of Applicant's amended claims 11, 30, and 38. Claims 11, 30, and 38 have each been amended to specifically recite that the symbology includes a velocity vector and an acceleration ball as generally recited in allowable claim 39. Furthermore, claims 11 and 30 specifically recite said symbology relates an aircraft velocity vector relative an aircraft current position point and an acceleration ball relative said velocity vector. The amended claims are properly allowable.

New claims 42-52 recite other features of the symbology which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references and are thus properly allowable.


Please charge \$350 for 7 claims in excess of 20 and any additional fees or extensions that may be required to Deposit Account No. 19-2189.

67008-123
S-5669

Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a teleconference will facilitate moving this case forward to being issued, Applicant's representative can be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.



DAVID L. WISZ
Registration No. 46,350
Attorneys for Applicant
400 West Maple, Suite 350
Birmingham, Michigan 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: April 12, 2006

N:\Client\SIKORSKY\00123\PATENT\Sikorsky 123 - 01-12-2006.doc